On an inverse problem in the parabolic equation arising from groundwater pollution problem

Thanh Binh Tran[a], Huy Tuan Nguyen[b,*], Van Thinh Nguyen[d], Vo Anh Khoa[c]

[a]*Department of Mathematics and Applications, Sai Gon University, Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam*
[b]*Faculty of Mathematics and Statistics, Ton Duc Thang University, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam.*
[c]*Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Gran Sasso Science Institute, Viale Francesco Crispi 7, 67100 L'Aquila, Italy.*
[d]*Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea*

arXiv:1408.1923v2 [math.AP] 31 Mar 2015

Abstract

In this paper, we consider an inverse problem to determine a source term in a parabolic equation, where the data are obtained at a certain time. In general, this problem is ill-posed, therefore the Tikhonov regularization method is proposed to solve the problem. In the theoretical results, a priori error estimate between the exact solution and its regularized solution is obtained. We also propose both methods, a priori and a posteriori parameter choice rules. In addition, the proposed methods have been verified by numerical experiments to estimate the errors between the regularized solutions and exact solutions. Eventually, from the numerical results it shows that the a posteriori parameter choice rule method gives a better the convergence speed in comparison with the a priori parameter choice rule method in some specific applications.
Keywords and phrases: Cauchy problem; Ill-posed problem; Convergence estimates.
Mathematics subject Classification 2000: 35K05, 35K99, 47J06, 47H10

1. Introduction

Groundwater is crucial to human being, environment and economy, because a large portion of drinking water comes from groundwater, and it is extracted for commercial, industrial and irrigation uses. Groundwater also sustains stream flow during dry periods, and is critical to the function of streams, wetlands and other aquatic environments. Therefore, protecting the safety and security of groundwater is essential for communities, and for the environment. In recent years, mathematical models have been used to analyze ground water system. There are two notable approaches in dealing with groundwater modeling, the forward and backward approaches. The former is going to predict unknown variables by solving appropriate governing equations, while the latter is going to determine unknown physical parameters. Most of groundwater models are distributed parameter models, where the parameters used in the modeling equations are not directly obtained from physical observations, but from trial-and-error and graphical fitting techniques. If large errors are included in mathematical model structure, model parameters, sink/source terms and boundary conditions, the model cannot produce accurate results. To deal with this issue, the inverse problem of parameter identification has been applied. In groundwater applications such as in finding a previous pollution source intensity from observation data of the pollutant concentrations at a later time, or in designing the final state of melting and freezing processes, it

*Corresponding Author: Nguyen Huy Tuan; Email: thnguyen2683@gmail.com;

is necessary to construct a heat source at any given time from the final outcome state data. The groundwater inverse problem has been studied since the middle of 1970s by McLaughin (1975), Yeh (1986), Kuiper (1986), Carrera (1987), Ginn and Cushman (1990) and Sun (1994), etc (see in [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26]). Some remarkable results on this research area should be mentioned by McLaughlin and Townley (1996) [27] and Poeter and Hill (1997) [28]. Under consideration of a solute diffusion, the flow and self-purifying function of watershed system, the concentration of pollution $u(x,t)$ at any time in a watershed is described by the following one-dimensional linear parabolic equation:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \eta \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \nu \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \gamma u = P(x,t), \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}$ is the spatial studied domain, η is the diffusion coefficient, ν is mean velocity of water in the watershed, and γ is the self-purifying function of the watershed, $P(x,t)$ is the source term causing the pollution function $u(x,t)$. By setting

$$w(x,t) = u(x,t) \exp\left(\frac{\nu}{2\eta}x - \left(\frac{\nu^2}{4\eta} + \gamma\right)t\right)$$

and

$$F(x,t) = P(x,t) \exp\left(\left(\frac{\nu^2}{4\eta} + \gamma\right)t - \frac{\nu}{2\eta}x\right),$$

Then Eq. (1.1) becomes

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial t} - \eta \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} = F(x,t).$$

This equation is well-known to be the parabolic heat equation with time-dependent coefficients. This equation has been investigated for the heat source with either temporal [6, 8, 13], or spatial-dependent [1, 3, 5, 14, 15] only. There are few studies on identification of the source term depending on both time and space in term of a separable form of $F(x,t)$, as $F(x,t) = \varphi(t)f(x)$; where $\varphi(t)$ is a given function; for instance Hassanov [7] identified the heat source in the form of $F(x,t) = F(x)H(t)$ for the variable coefficient heat conduction equation; $u_t = (k(x)u_x)_x + F(x)H(t)$ under the variational method. However, in the case with the time-dependent coefficient of $\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2}$, there are still limited results.

In this study, we consider the equation for groundwater pollution as follows:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(a(t)\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}\right) = \varphi(t) f(x), \quad (x,t) \in (0,\pi) \times (0,T), \tag{1.2}$$

with initial and final conditions

$$u(x,0) = 0, \quad u(x,T) = g(x), \quad x \in (0,\pi), \tag{1.3}$$

and boundary condition

$$u(0,t) = u(\pi,t) = 0. \tag{1.4}$$

Here, $a(t) > 0$, $g(x)$ and $\varphi(t)$ are given functions. In this paper, we will determine the source term $f(x)$ from the inexact observed data of $\varphi(t)$ and $g(x)$.

Let $\|.\|$ and $\langle .,. \rangle$ be the norm and the inner product in $L^2(0,\pi)$, respectively. Now, we take an orthonormal basis in $L^2(0,\pi)$ satisfying the boundary condition (1.4), particularly the basic function

$\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\sin(nx)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies that condition. Then, by an elementary calculation the problem (1.2) under the conditions (1.3) and (1.4) can be transformed into the following corresponding problem

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle u(x,t), \sin(nx)\rangle + n^2 a(t)\langle u(x,t), \sin(nx)\rangle = \varphi(t)\langle f(x), \sin(nx)\rangle, \quad t \in (0,T), \tag{1.5}$$

$$\langle u(x,0), \sin(nx)\rangle = 0, \quad \langle u(x,T), \sin(nx)\rangle = \langle g(x), \sin(nx)\rangle. \tag{1.6}$$

By setting $A(t) = \int_0^t a(s)\,ds$, we can solve the ordinary differential equation (1.5) with the contitions (1.6). We thus obtain

$$\langle f(x), \sin(nx)\rangle = e^{n^2A(T)}\left(\int_0^T e^{n^2A(t)}\varphi(t)\,dt\right)^{-1}\langle g(x), \sin(nx)\rangle, \tag{1.7}$$

which leads to

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{n^2A(T)}\left(\int_0^T e^{n^2A(t)}\varphi(t)\,dt\right)^{-1} g_n \sin(nx), \tag{1.8}$$

where $g_n = \frac{2}{\pi}\langle g(x), \sin(nx)\rangle$.

Note that $e^{n^2A(T)}$ increases rather quickly once n becomes large. Thus, the exact data function $g(x)$ must satisfy that g_n decays at least as the same speed of $e^{n^2A(t)}$. However, in application the input data $g(x)$ from observations will never be exact due to the measurements. We assume the data functions $g_\epsilon(x) \in L^2(0,\pi)$, and $\varphi(t), \varphi_\epsilon(t) \in L^2(0,T)$ satisfy

$$\|g_\epsilon - g\| \le \epsilon, \quad \|\varphi_\epsilon - \varphi\| \le \epsilon, \tag{1.9}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ represents a noise from observations.

The main objective of this paper is to determine a conditional stability, and provide the revised generalized Tikhonov regularization method. In addition, the stability estimate between the regularization solution and the exact solution is obtained. For explanation of this method, we impose an a priori bound on the data

$$\|f\|_{H^k(0,\pi)} \le M, \quad k \ge 0, \tag{1.10}$$

where $M \ge 0$ is a constant, and $\|.\|_{H^k(0,\pi)}$ denotes the norm in the Sobolev space $H^k(0,\pi)$ of order k can be naturally defined in terms of Fourier series whose coefficients decay rapidly; namely,

$$H^k(0,\pi) := \left\{f \in L^2(0,\pi) : \|f\|_{H^k(0,\pi)} < \infty\right\}, \tag{1.11}$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{H^k(0,\pi)} = \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(1+n^2)^k f_n^2},$$

where f_n defined by $f_n = \langle f, X_n\rangle, X_n = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\sin(nx)$ is the Fourier coefficient of f.

As a regularization method, the Tikhonov method has been used to solve ill-posed problems in a number of publications. However, most of previous works focus on an a priori choice of the regularization parameter. There is usually a defect in any a priori method; i.e. the a priori choice

of the regularization parameter depends obviously on the a priori bound M of the unknown solution. In fact, the a priori bound M cannot be known exactly in practice, and working with a wrong constant M may lead to a bad regularization solution. In this paper, we mainly consider the a posteriori choice of a regularization parameter for the mollification method. Using the discrepancy principle we provide a new posteriori parameter choice rule.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, a conditional stability is introduced. A Tikhonov regularization and its convergence under an a priori parameter choice rule is presented in Section 3. Similarly to Section 3, another Tikhonov regularization and its convergence under a posteriori parameter choice rule is shown in Section 4. In Section 5, we introduce two numerical examples, which are implemented from proposal regularization methods, the numerical results are compared with exact solutions.

2. A conditional stability

Let $a, \varphi, \varphi_\epsilon : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous functions. We suppose that there exist constants $B_1, B_2, C_1, C_2, D_1, D_2 > 0$ such that

$$B_1 \le \varphi(t) \le B_2, \quad C_1 \le \varphi_\epsilon(t) \le C_2, \quad D_1 \le a(t) \le D_2. \tag{2.12}$$

Hereafter, let us set

$$A(t) - A(T) = B(t), \quad \Phi(n,h) = \int_0^T e^{n^2 B(t)} h(t)\, dt, \tag{2.13}$$

where h plays a role as φ, and φ_ϵ by implication. Then, we can obtain the following conditional stability.

Lemma 2.1. *For all continuous functions $h \in [E_1, E_2]$, then*

$$(\Phi(n,h))^k \le \begin{cases} E_2^k n^{-2k} D_1^{-k} \left(1 - e^{-n^2 D_2 T}\right)^k & , k \ge 0, \\ E_1^k n^{-2k} D_2^{-k} \left(1 - e^{-D_1 T}\right)^k & , k < 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.14}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. The proof is simple by elementary calculation. □

Theorem 2.1. *If there exists $M \ge 0$ such that $\|f\|_{H^k(0,\pi)} \le M$, then*

$$\|f\| \le \left(\frac{D_2}{B_1 (1 - e^{-D_1 T})}\right)^{\frac{k}{k+2}} M^{\frac{2}{k+2}} \|g\|^{\frac{k}{k+2}}. \tag{2.15}$$

Proof. Using Holder's inequality, we first have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|^2 &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\int_0^T e^{n^2 B(t)} \varphi(t)\, dt \right)^{-2} g_n^{\frac{4}{k+2}} g_n^{\frac{2k}{k+2}} \\ &\le \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\int_0^T e^{n^2 B(t)} \varphi(t)\, dt \right)^{-(k+2)} g_n^2 \right]^{\frac{2}{k+2}} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_n^2 \right)^{\frac{k}{k+2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Then from (1.7), the inequality becomes

$$\|f\|^2 \leq \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}\varphi(t)\,dt\right)^{-k} f_n^2\right]^{\frac{2}{k+2}} \|g\|^{\frac{2k}{k+2}}. \tag{2.17}$$

We pay attention to the integral on the right-hand side by direct estimate and computation. From (2.12), we thus get

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|^2 &\leq \left(\frac{D_2^k}{[B_1(1-e^{-D_1T})]^k}\right)^{\frac{2}{k+2}} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2k} f_n^2\right)^{\frac{2}{k+2}} \|g\|^{\frac{2k}{k+2}} \\ &\leq \left[\frac{D_2}{B_1(1-e^{-D_1T})}\right]^{\frac{2k}{k+2}} \|f\|_{H^k(0,\pi)}^{\frac{4}{k+2}} \|g\|^{\frac{2k}{k+2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

Hence, the theorem has been proved. □

3. Tikhonov regularization under an a priori parameter choice rule

Define a linear operator $K : L^2(0,\pi) \to L^2(0,\pi)$ as follows.

$$Kf(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle f, X_n\rangle \int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}dtX_n(x) = \int_0^{\pi} k(x,\xi) f(\xi)\,d\xi, \tag{3.19}$$

where $k(x,\xi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}dtX_n(x)X_n(\xi)$. Due to $k(x,\xi) = k(\xi,x)$, K is self-adjoint. Next, we prove its compactness. Let us consider finite rank operators K_m by

$$K_m f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{m} \langle f, X_n\rangle \int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}dtX_n(x). \tag{3.20}$$

Then, from (3.19) and (3.20), we have

$$\|K_m f - Kf\|^2 = \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty}\left(\int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}dt\right)^2 f_n^2 \leq \frac{1}{m^4D_1^2}\sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} f_n^2 \leq \frac{1}{m^4D_1^2}\|f\|^2. \tag{3.21}$$

Therefore, $\|K_m - K\| \to 0$ in the sense of operator norm in $\mathcal{L}\left(L^2(0,\pi); L^2(0,\pi)\right)$, as $m \to \infty$. K is also a compact operator. Next, the singular values for the linear self-adjoint compact operator are

$$\sigma_n = \int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}dt, \tag{3.22}$$

and corresponding eigenvectors are X_n known as an orthonormal basis in $L^2(0,\pi)$. From (3.19), the inverse source problem introduced above can be formulated as an operator equation.

$$(Kf)(x) = g(x). \tag{3.23}$$

In general, such a problem is ill-posed. From the point of view, we aim at solving it by using Tikhonov regularization method, i.e. the study of minimizing the following quantity in $L^2(0,\pi)$

$$\|Kf - g\|^2 + \mu^2\|f\|^2. \tag{3.24}$$

As shown in [20] by Theorem 2.12, its minimizer f_μ satisfies

$$K^*Kf_\mu(x) + \mu^2 f_\mu(x) = K^*g(x). \tag{3.25}$$

Due to singular value decomposition for compact self-adjoint operator, we have

$$f_\mu(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\mu^2 + \left(\int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}\varphi(t)\,dt\right)^2\right)^{-1}\int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}\varphi(t)\,dt\,\langle g, X_n\rangle X_n(x). \tag{3.26}$$

If the given data is noised, we can establish

$$f_\mu^\epsilon(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\mu^2 + \left(\int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}\varphi_\epsilon(t)\,dt\right)^2\right)^{-1}\int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}\varphi_\epsilon(t)\,dt\,\langle g_\epsilon, X_n\rangle X_n(x). \tag{3.27}$$

From (2.13), (3.26) and (3.27), we get

$$f_\mu(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}\langle g, X_n\rangle X_n(x), \tag{3.28}$$

$$f_\mu^\epsilon(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}\langle g_\epsilon, X_n\rangle X_n(x). \tag{3.29}$$

In this work, we will deduce an error estimate for $\left\|f - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\|$ and show convergence rate under a suitable choice of regularization parameters. It is clear that the entire error can be decomposed into the bias and noise propagation as follows:

$$\left\|f - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\| \le \left\|f - f_\mu\right\| + \left\|f_\mu - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\|. \tag{3.30}$$

We first give the error bound for the noise term.

Lemma 3.1. *If the noise assumption holds and assume that $\|g - g_\epsilon\| \le \epsilon$ and $\|\varphi - \varphi_\epsilon\|_{L^2[0,T]} \le \epsilon$, then the solution depends continuously on the given data. Moreover, we have the following estimate.*

$$\left\|f_\mu - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\| \le \frac{\|f\|\left(\mu^2 + D_1^{-2}B_2C_2\right)}{4\mu^2T^2B_1C_1}\|\varphi - \varphi_\epsilon\|_{L^2[0,T]} + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|g - g_\epsilon\|. \tag{3.31}$$

Proof. We notice that

$$\begin{aligned} f_\mu - f_\mu^\epsilon &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}g_nX_n - \frac{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}g_nX_n\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}g_nX_n - \frac{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}g_n^\epsilon X_n\right) \\ &= A_1 + A_2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

We consider two following estimates by diving into two steps.
Step 1. Estimate $\|A_1\|$

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\mu^2\Phi(n,|\mu-\mu_\epsilon|) + \Phi(n,\varphi)\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)\Phi(n,|\varphi-\varphi_\epsilon|)}{\left[\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2\right]\left[\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2\right]}g_nX_n \\ &\le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\left(\mu^2 + \Phi(n,\varphi)\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)\right)\Phi(n,|\varphi-\varphi_\epsilon|)}{4\mu^2\Phi(n,\varphi)\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}g_nX_n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

Notice that

$$\Phi(n,\varphi)\,\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon) \le B_2C_2\left(\int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}dt\right)^2, \quad \Phi(n,|\varphi-\varphi_\epsilon|) \le \|\varphi-\varphi_\epsilon\|_{L^2[0,T]}\left(\int_0^T e^{2n^2B(t)}dt\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.34}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A_1\| &\le \frac{\|\varphi-\varphi_\epsilon\|_{L^2[0,T]}\left(\mu^2+B_2C_2\left(\int_0^T e^{n^2B(t)}dt\right)^2\right)}{4\mu^2T^2B_1C_1}\|f\| \\
&\le \frac{\|\varphi-\varphi_\epsilon\|_{L^2[0,T]}\left(\mu^2+n^{-4}D_1^{-2}B_2C_2\left(1-e^{-n^2D_2T}\right)^2\right)}{4\mu^2T^2B_1C_1}\|f\| \\
&\le \frac{\|f\|\left(\mu^2+D_1^{-2}B_2C_2\right)}{4\mu^2T^2B_1C_1}\|\varphi-\varphi_\epsilon\|_{L^2[0,T]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

Step 2. Estimate $\|A_2\|$

$$\|A_2\| \le \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{(\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}{\mu^2+(\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}\left|g_n-g_n^\epsilon\right|^2} \le \frac{1}{2\mu}\|g-g_\epsilon\|. \tag{3.36}$$

Combining (3.35) and (3.36), the proof is completed. □

In order to obtain the boundedness of bias, we usually need some a priori conditions. By Tikhonov's theorem, the operator K^{-1} is restricted to the continuous image of a compact set M. Thus, we assume f is in a compact subset of $L^2(0,\pi)$. Hereafter, we assume that $\|f\|_{H^{2k}(0,\pi)} \le M$ for $k>0$.

Lemma 3.2. *If the a priori bound holds, then*

$$\left\|f-f_\mu\right\| \le \begin{cases} \max\left\{1,\frac{D_2^2}{[B_1(1-e^{-D_1T})]^2}\right\}M\mu^{\frac{k}{2}} & ,0<k\le 2, \\ \max\left\{1,\frac{D_2^2}{[B_1(1-e^{-D_1T})]^2}\right\}M\mu & ,k>2. \end{cases} \tag{3.37}$$

Proof. From (1.8) and (3.26), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|f-f_\mu\right\|^2 &\le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\mu^4}{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2\left(\mu^2+(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2\right)^2}g_n^2 \\
&\le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}P(n)\frac{\left(1+n^2\right)^{2k}g_n^2}{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

where

$$P(n) = \frac{\mu^4}{\left(\mu^2+(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2\right)^2}\left(1+n^2\right)^{-2k}. \tag{3.39}$$

Next, we estimate $P(n)$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mu^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ is not integer. Therefore, (3.38) can be divided into the sum of A_1 and A_2 as follows:

$$A_1 = \sum_{n=1}^{n_0}P(n)\frac{\left(1+n^2\right)^{2k}g_n^2}{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}, \quad A_2 = \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty}P(n)\frac{\left(1+n^2\right)^{2k}g_n^2}{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}, \tag{3.40}$$

where $n_0 \leq \mu^{-\frac{1}{4}} \leq n_0 + 1$. In A_1, we have

$$P(n) \leq \frac{\mu^4 n^8 D_2^4}{\left[B_1\left(1 - e^{-D_1 T}\right)\right]^4} \left(1 + n^2\right)^{-2k} \leq \frac{D_2^4}{\left[B_1\left(1 - e^{-D_1 T}\right)\right]^4} \mu^4 n^{8-4k}. \tag{3.41}$$

For $0 < k \leq 2$, we deduce that

$$P(n) \leq \frac{D_2^4}{\left[B_1\left(1 - e^{-D_1 T}\right)\right]^4} \mu^{k+2} \leq \frac{D_2^4}{\left[B_1\left(1 - e^{-D_1 T}\right)\right]^4} \mu^k. \tag{3.42}$$

For $k > 2$, it yields

$$P(n) \leq \frac{D_2^4}{\left[B_1\left(1 - e^{-D_1 T}\right)\right]^4} \mu^4. \tag{3.43}$$

In addition, we observe in A_2 that

$$P(n) \leq \left(1 + n^2\right)^{-2k} \leq \mu^k. \tag{3.44}$$

From (3.42)-(3.44), we thus obtain

$$P(n) \leq \begin{cases} \max\left\{1, \frac{D_2^4}{\left[B_1\left(1-e^{-D_1 T}\right)\right]^4}\right\} \mu^k & , 0 < k \leq 2, \\ \max\left\{1, \frac{D_2^4}{\left[B_1\left(1-e^{-D_1 T}\right)\right]^4}\right\} \mu^2 & , k > 2. \end{cases} \tag{3.45}$$

Hence, by using the assumption, we conclude that

$$\left\|f - f_\mu\right\| \leq \begin{cases} \max\left\{1, \frac{D_2^2}{\left[B_1\left(1-e^{-D_1 T}\right)\right]^2}\right\} M \mu^{\frac{k}{2}} & , 0 < k \leq 2, \\ \max\left\{1, \frac{D_2^2}{\left[B_1\left(1-e^{-D_1 T}\right)\right]^2}\right\} M \mu & , k > 2. \end{cases} \tag{3.46}$$

□

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that the a priori condition and the noise assumption hold, the following estimates are obtained.*

a. *If* $0 < k \leq 2$ *and choose* $\mu = \left(\frac{\epsilon}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{k+2}}$, *then*

$$\left\|f - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\| \leq P\left[\|f\|\left(\epsilon^{\frac{2}{k+2}} + D_1^{-2} B_2 C_2 M^{\frac{2}{k+2}}\right)\epsilon^{\frac{k}{k+2}} + \epsilon^{\frac{k+1}{k+2}} + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{k+2}}\right], \tag{3.47}$$

where P is constant and depends on constants T, B_1, C_1, D_1, D_2, *and M (shown in Sec. 2).*

b. *If* $k > 2$ *and choose* $\mu = \left(\frac{\epsilon}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, *then*

$$\left\|f - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\| \leq Q\epsilon\left[\|f\|\left(1 + \frac{D_1^{-2} B_2 C_2}{M}\epsilon\right) + 1\right], \tag{3.48}$$

where Q is constant and depends on T, B_1, C_1, D_1, D_2, M.

Proof. From Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, we can obtain the proof easily. Indeed, for $0 < k \leq 2$, using $\mu = \left(\frac{\epsilon}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{k+2}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|f - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\| &\leq \frac{\|f\|}{4T^2B_1C_1}\left(1 + \frac{D_1^{-2}B_2C_2}{\mu^2}\right)\|\varphi - \varphi_\epsilon\|_{L^2[0,T]} + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|g - g_\epsilon\| \\ &\quad + \max\left\{1, \frac{D_2^2}{\left[B_1\left(1 - e^{-D_1T}\right)\right]^2}\right\} M\mu^{\frac{k}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\|f\|}{4T^2B_1C_1}\left(\epsilon^{\frac{2}{k+2}} + D_1^{-2}B_2C_2M^{\frac{2}{k+2}}\right)\epsilon^{\frac{k}{k+2}} + \frac{1}{2}M^{\frac{1}{k+2}}\epsilon^{\frac{k+1}{k+2}} \\ &\quad + \max\left\{1, \frac{D_2^2}{\left[B_1\left(1 - e^{-D_1T}\right)\right]^2}\right\} M\epsilon^{\frac{1}{k+2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.49}$$

Besides, for $k > 2$, choosing $\mu = \left(\frac{\epsilon}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ will lead to the following estimate.

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|f - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\| &\leq \frac{\|f\|}{4T^2B_1C_1}\left(1 + \frac{D_1^{-2}B_2C_2}{M}\epsilon\right)\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}M^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \max\left\{1, \frac{D_2^2}{\left[B_1\left(1 - e^{-D_1T}\right)\right]^2}\right\} M^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.50}$$

□

4. Tikhonov regularization under a posteriori parameter choice rule

In this section, we consider an a posteriori regularization parameter choice in Morozov's discrepancy principle (see in [18, 19]). First, we introduce the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *Set* $\rho(\mu) = \left\|Kf_\mu^\epsilon - g_\epsilon\right\|$ *and assume that* $0 < \epsilon < \|g_\epsilon\|$, *then the following results hold:*

a. $\rho(\mu)$ *is a continuous function.*

b. $\rho(\mu) \to 0$ *as* $\mu \to 0$.

c. $\rho(\mu) \to \|g_\epsilon\|$ *as* $\mu \to \infty$.

d. $\rho(\mu)$ *is a strictly increasing function.*

Proof. All results are derived from

$$\rho(\mu) = \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\mu^2}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}\right)^2 (g_n^\epsilon)^2}. \tag{4.51}$$

□

Let us define a function $H(y)$ as follows.

$$H(y) = \begin{cases} y^y(1-y)^{1-y} & , y \in (0,1), \\ 1 & , y = \{0;1\}. \end{cases} \tag{4.52}$$

It is clear that $0 < H(y) \leq 1$ since we have

$$\sup_{x>0} \frac{x^y}{1+x} = H(y), \quad y \in [0,1]. \tag{4.53}$$

Lemma 4.2. *Choose $\tau > 1$ such that $0 < \tau\epsilon < \|g_\epsilon\|$, then there exists a unique regularization parameter $\mu > 0$ such that $\left\|Kf_\mu^\epsilon - g_\epsilon\right\| = \tau\epsilon$. Moreover, if the a priori condition with $k \in (0,1]$ and the noise assumptions hold, we have the following inequality*

$$\frac{\epsilon}{\mu^{k+1}} \leq \frac{P}{\tau - 1} H\left(\frac{1-k}{2}\right) M, \tag{4.54}$$

where P is constant, and depends on the constants k, T, B_2, C_1, D_1, D_2.

Proof. The uniqueness of regularization parameter $\mu > 0$ is derived from Lemma 4.1. We thus only need to prove the inequality. First, we notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau\epsilon &= \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}\right)^2 (g_n^\epsilon)^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}\right)^2 (g_n - g_n^\epsilon)^2} \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\mu^2 \Phi(n,\varphi)}{\left(\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2\right)(1+n^2)^k}\right)^2 \frac{(1+n^2)^{2k} (g_n)^2}{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.55}$$

Due to $\dfrac{\mu^2}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2} \leq 1$ and setting

$$K(n) = \frac{\mu^2 \Phi(n,\varphi)}{\left(\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2\right)(1+n^2)^k}, \tag{4.56}$$

we then have

$$\tau\epsilon \leq \epsilon + \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} K^2(n) \frac{(1+n^2)^{2k} (g_n)^2}{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}}. \tag{4.57}$$

Now, we estimate $K(n)$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
K(n) &\leq \frac{\left(\frac{\mu}{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}\right)^{1-k} \Phi(n,\varphi) (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^{k-3}}{\left(\left(\frac{\mu}{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}\right)^2 + 1\right)(1+n^2)^k} \mu^{k+1} \\
&\leq H\left(\frac{1-k}{2}\right) \mu^{k+1} B_2 C_1 D_1^{-1} D_2^{3-k} \frac{\left(1 - e^{-D_1 T}\right)^{k-3}}{n^{2(k-2)} (1+n^2)^k} \\
&\leq H\left(\frac{1-k}{2}\right) \mu^{k+1} B_2 C_1 D_1^{-1} D_2^{3-k} \left(1 - e^{-D_1 T}\right)^{k-3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.58}$$

Therefore, combining (4.57) and (4.58), we conclude that

$$\tau\epsilon \leq \epsilon + B_2 C_1 D_1^{-1} D_2^{3-k} \left(1 - e^{-D_1 T}\right)^{k-3} H\left(\frac{1-k}{2}\right) \mu^{k+1} M, \tag{4.59}$$

which gives the desired result. □

Theorem 4.1. *Assume the a priori condition and the noise assumptions hold, and there exists* $\tau > 1$ *such that* $0 < \tau\epsilon < \|g_\epsilon\|$. *Then, we choose a unique regularization parameter* $\mu > 0$ *such that*

$$\left\|f - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\| \leq \begin{cases} \epsilon^{\frac{k}{k+1}} P & , 0 < k \leq 1, \\ \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Q & , k > 1, \end{cases} \tag{4.60}$$

where constants P *and* Q *depend on the constants* $T, \mu, k, \tau, B_1, B_2, C_1, C_2, D_1, D_2$ *and* M.

Proof. For $0 < k \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|f - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\| &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\Phi(n,\varphi)} \left[g_n - \frac{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} g_n^\epsilon \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} - \frac{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2} \right] g_n^\epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{4.61}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|f - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\|^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} \left[g_n - \frac{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} g_n^\epsilon \right]^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\left[\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} - \frac{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2} \right] g_n^\epsilon \right)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.62}$$

We set K_1 and K_2 as follows.

$$K_1(n) = \frac{1}{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} \left[g_n - \frac{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} g_n^\epsilon \right]^{\frac{2}{k+1}} \left[g_n - \frac{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} g_n^\epsilon \right]^{\frac{2k}{k+1}}, \tag{4.63}$$

$$K_2(n) = \left(\left[\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} - \frac{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2} \right] g_n^\epsilon \right)^2. \tag{4.64}$$

Afterwards, we estimate $\left\|f - f_\mu^\epsilon\right\|$ by considering the following inequalities. First, we see that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} K_1(n) \leq L_1^{\frac{k}{k+1}} L_2^{\frac{1}{k+1}}, \tag{4.65}$$

where

$$L_1 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(g_n - \frac{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} g_n^\epsilon \right)^2, \tag{4.66}$$

$$L_2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\Phi(n,\varphi))^{-2(k+1)} \left(g_n - \frac{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} g_n^\epsilon \right)^2. \tag{4.67}$$

Now, to estimate B_1 and B_2 as follows:

$$L_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (g_n - g_n^\epsilon)^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(g_n^\epsilon - \frac{(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(n,\varphi))^2} g_n^\epsilon \right)^2} \leq (1 + \tau)\epsilon. \tag{4.68}$$

$$L_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^{-2(k+1)} g_n^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^{-2(k+1)} \left(\frac{\left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^2}{\mu^2 + \left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^2}\right)^2 \left(g_n^{\epsilon}\right)^2}. \tag{4.69}$$

In (4.69), we continue to estimate two terms (denoted by L_3 and L_4, respectively) by direct computation.

$$\begin{aligned} L_3 &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\left(1+n^2\right)\right)^{-2k} \frac{\left(1+n^2\right)^{2k} g_n^2}{\left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^2}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{n^2 D_2}{B_1\left(1-e^{-D_1 T}\right)\left(1+n^2\right)}\right)^{2k} \frac{\left(1+n^2\right)^{2k} g_n^2}{\left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^2}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{D_2}{B_1\left(1-e^{-D_1 T}\right)}\right)^k M. \end{aligned} \tag{4.70}$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_4 \leq & \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^{-2(k+1)} \left(\frac{\left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^2}{\mu^2 + \left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^2}\right)^2 \left(g_n - g_n^{\epsilon}\right)^2} \\ & + \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^{-2(k+1)} \left(\frac{\left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^2}{\mu^2 + \left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^2}\right)^2 \left(g_n\right)^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.71}$$

In (4.71), we denote two terms in the right-hand side by L_5 and L_6. Then, using Theorem 4.1 and (4.70) we estimate them as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} L_5 &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^{-2(k+1)} \left(\frac{\left(\frac{\mu}{\Phi(n,\varphi)}\right)^{k+1}}{\left(\frac{\mu}{\Phi(n,\varphi)}\right)^2 + 1}\right)^2 \left(g_n - g_n^{\epsilon}\right)^2} \\ &\leq \mu^{-(k+1)} H\left(\frac{k+1}{2}\right)\epsilon \\ &\leq \frac{P}{\tau - 1} H\left(\frac{1-k}{2}\right) H\left(\frac{k+1}{2}\right) M \\ &\leq \frac{P}{\tau - 1}\left(H\left(\frac{1-k}{2}\right)\right)^2 M. \end{aligned} \tag{4.72}$$

$$L_6 \leq \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\Phi\left(n,\varphi\right)\right)^{-2(k+1)} \left(g_n\right)^2} \leq \left(\frac{D_2}{B_1\left(1-e^{-D_1 T}\right)}\right)^k M. \tag{4.73}$$

Therefore, from (4.66)-(4.73) we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} K_1\left(n\right) \leq \left[\left(1+\tau\right)\epsilon\right]^{\frac{2k}{k+1}} \left[2\left(\frac{D_2}{B_1\left(1-e^{-D_1 T}\right)}\right)^k M + \frac{P}{\tau - 1}\left(H\left(\frac{1-k}{2}\right)\right)^2 M\right]^{\frac{2}{k+1}}. \tag{4.74}$$

Next, estimating $K_2(n)$ is in process. Similarly, we look back (3.33)-(3.35), then see that

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} K_2(n)} &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\left[\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi)}{\mu^2+(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}-\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}{\mu^2+(\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}\right](g_n^\epsilon-g_n)\right)^2}\\ &\quad+\sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\left[\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi)}{\mu^2+(\Phi(n,\varphi))^2}-\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}{\mu^2+(\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}\right]g_n\right)^2}\\ &\leq \|\varphi_\epsilon-\varphi\|_{L^2[0,T]}\left(P\|g_\epsilon-g\|+\|f\|\right). \qquad (4.75)\end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.62), (4.74) and (4.75) gives the first desired. Moreover, we can obtain the second by embedding H^{2k} into H^1. □

5. Numerical Examples

In this section, we shall implement our proposed regularization methods. Two different numerical examples (choosing $k = T = 1$) are shown. The first example is to consider an example with a in Eq. (2) is a constant, and the function f obtained from exact data function. The second example is to consider an example with a is a non-constant function, and f obtained from observation data of g and φ.
The couple of $(g_\epsilon, \varphi_\epsilon)$, which is determined below, plays as measured data with a random noise as follows:

$$g_\epsilon(.) = g(.)\left(1+\frac{\epsilon\cdot \mathrm{rand}(.)}{\|g\|}\right), \qquad (5.76)$$

$$\varphi_\epsilon(.) = \varphi(.)+\epsilon\cdot \mathrm{rand}(.), \qquad (5.77)$$

where $\mathtt{rand}(\cdot)\in(-1,1)$ is a random number. By those measured ways, we can easily verify the validity of the inequality:

$$\|g-g_\epsilon\|\leq\epsilon$$

and

$$\|\varphi-\varphi_\epsilon\|\leq\epsilon$$

In addition, there is a possibility of taking the regularization parameter for the a priori parameter choice rule $\mu=\left(\frac{\epsilon}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$ where M plays a role as a priori condition computed by $\|f\|_{H^2(0,\pi)}$. The absolute and relative errors between regularized and exact solutions are computed. On the other hand, the regularized solution are defined by:

$$f_\mu^\epsilon(x)=\frac{2}{\pi}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\frac{\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)}{\mu^2+(\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}\langle g_\epsilon(x),\sin(nx)\rangle\sin(nx), \qquad (5.78)$$

$$\Phi(n,\varphi_\epsilon)=\int_0^1 e^{n^2(A(t)-A(1))}\varphi_\epsilon(t)\,dt, \qquad (5.79)$$

where N is the truncation number; whereby $N = 1000$ is chosen in the examples.
In general, the whole numerical procedure is shown in the following steps:
Step 1. Choosing L and K to generate temporal and spatial discretizations as follows:

$$x_j=j\Delta x,\Delta x=\frac{\pi}{K},j=\overline{0,K}, \qquad (5.80)$$

$$t_i = i\Delta t, \Delta t = \frac{1}{L}, i = \overline{0, L}. \tag{5.81}$$

Obviously, the higher value of L and K will provide more stable and accurate numerical calculation, however in our examples $L = K = 100$ are satisfied.

Step 2. Setting $f_\mu^\epsilon\left(x_j\right) = f_{\mu,j}^\epsilon$ and $f\left(x_j\right) = f_j$, constructing two vectors containing all discrete values of f_μ^ϵ and f denoted by Λ_μ^ϵ and Ψ, respectively.

$$\Lambda_\mu^\epsilon = \left[f_{\mu,0}^\epsilon \quad f_{\mu,1}^\epsilon \quad \dots \quad f_{\mu,K-1}^\epsilon \quad f_{\mu,K}^\epsilon\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{K+1}, \tag{5.82}$$

$$\Psi = \left[f_0 \quad f_1 \quad \dots \quad f_{K-1} \quad f_K\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{K+1}. \tag{5.83}$$

Step 3. Error estimate between the exact solution and regularized solution;
Absolute error estimation:

$$E_1 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{K+1}\sum_{j=0}^{K}\left|f_\mu^\epsilon\left(x_j\right) - f\left(x_j\right)\right|^2}, \tag{5.84}$$

$$\tag{5.85}$$

Relative error estimation:

$$E_2 = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^{K}\left|f_\mu^\epsilon\left(x_j\right) - f\left(x_j\right)\right|^2}}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^{K}\left|f\left(x_j\right)\right|^2}}. \tag{5.86}$$

5.1. Example 1

As mentioned above, in this example we consider a is constant, and f is an exact data function. Specifically, we consider a type of the problem (1.2)-(1.4) as follows

$$\begin{cases} u_t - u_{xx} = 2^{-1}\left(e^t - 1\right)\sin 2x; & (x,t) \in (0,\pi) \times (0,1), \\ u(x,0) = 0, \quad u(x,1) = 10^{-1}(e-1)\sin 2x; & x \in [0,\pi], \\ u(0,t) = u(\pi,t) = 0; & t \in [0,1], \end{cases} \tag{5.87}$$

This implies that $a(t) = 1, \varphi(t) = e^t - 1, g(x) = 10^{-1}(e-1)\sin 2x$ and $f(x) = 2^{-1}\sin 2x$.
It is easy to see that $u(x,t) = 10^{-1}\left(e^t - 1\right)\sin 2x$ is the unique solution of the problem. Next, we establish the regularized solution according to composite Simpson's rule.

$$f_\mu^\epsilon(x) = \frac{e-1}{10}\left(1 + \frac{\epsilon \cdot \text{rand}(.)}{\sqrt{\pi}\,\|g\|}\right)\frac{\Phi(2,\varphi_\epsilon)}{\mu^2 + (\Phi(2,\varphi_\epsilon))^2}\sin 2x, \tag{5.88}$$

$$\Phi(2,\varphi_\epsilon) = \frac{1}{3M}\left[h(t_0) + 2\sum_{i=1}^{\frac{L}{2}-1} h(t_{2i}) + 4\sum_{i=1}^{\frac{L}{2}} h(t_{2i-1}) + h(t_M)\right], \tag{5.89}$$

$$h(t_i) = e^{4(t_i-1)}\left(\varphi(t_i) + \epsilon \cdot |\text{rand}(t_i)|\right). \tag{5.90}$$

In practice, it is very difficult to obtain the value of M without having an exact solution. We thus try taking $M = 1000$ leading to $\mu_1 = \frac{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}{10}$ for the a priori parameter choice rule, and $\mu_2 = \frac{\epsilon^{\frac{9}{20}}}{40}$ for the a posteriori parameter choice rule based on (4.59) with $\tau = 1.5$.

5.2. Example 2

Similar to the first example, however in this example we consider $a(t) = 2t + 1$, then $A(t) - A(1) = t^2 + t - 2$; we choose

$$g(x) = e^3 \sum_{m=1}^{3} \sin(mx), \quad \varphi(t) = 1. \tag{5.91}$$

Thus, the exact solution is obtained by:

$$f(x) = \frac{2e^3}{\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{1000} \frac{1}{\Phi(n,1)} \sum_{m=1}^{3} \langle \sin(mx), \sin(nx) \rangle \sin(nx), \tag{5.92}$$

$$\Phi(n,1) = \frac{1}{n^2}\left(1 - e^{-2n^2}\right). \tag{5.93}$$

Unlike the first example, from the analytical solution, we can have $\|f\|_{H^2(0,\pi)} < 5500$ which implies that $\mu_1 = \left(\frac{\epsilon}{5500}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$ for the a priori parameter choice rule. Afterwards, based on (4.59) with $\tau = 1.1$ again, we can compute the regularization parameter for the a posteriori parameter choice rule, $\mu_2 = \frac{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1100}$. Therefore, the regularized solution can be computed by

$$f_\mu^\epsilon(x) = e^3\left(1 + \frac{\epsilon \cdot \text{rand}(.)}{\sqrt{\pi}\,\|g\|}\right) \sum_{n=1}^{3} \frac{n^2\left(1 - e^{-2n^2}\right)(1 + \epsilon \cdot \text{rand}(.))}{n^4\mu^2 + \left((1 + \epsilon \cdot \text{rand}(.))\left(1 - e^{-2n^2}\right)\right)^2} \sin(nx). \tag{5.94}$$

Tables 1 and 2 show the absolute and relative error estimates between the exact solution and its regularized solution for both, the a priori and the a posteriori, parameter choice rules in the numerical examples. In the first example as shown in Table 1; when a is constant, and f is an exact data function; it shows the convergence speed of both parameter choice rule methods are quite similar and slow as ϵ tends to 0. Whereas, in the second example shown in Table 2; when a is not a constant, and f is obtained from measured data; it shows the convergence speed of the a posteriori parameter choice rule is better than (by second order) the a priori parameter choice rule as ϵ tends to 0.

In addition, Figures 1 and 2 show a comparison between the exact solution and its regularized solution for the a priori parameter and the a posteriori parameter choice rules in the first example, respectively. It again shows that for the both parameter choice rule methods, the regularized solution was strong oscillated around the exact solution when ϵ around 0.1; nevertheless it converges to the exact solution as ϵ tends to 0. In the second example, Figures 3 and 4 show the same tendency as in the first example for both methods.

6. Conclusion

In this study, we solved the problem (1.2)-(1.4) to recover temperature function of the unknown sources in the parabolic equation with the time-dependent coefficient (i.e. inhomogeneous source) by suggesting two methods, the a priori and a posteriori parameter choice rules.

In the theoretical results, we obtained the error estimates of both methods based on a priori condition. From the numerical results, it shows that the regularized solutions are converged to the exact solutions. Furthermore, it also shows that the a posteriori parameter choice rule method is better than the a priori parameter choice rule method in term of the convergence speed.

Acknowledgments

This research is funded by Foundation for Science and Technology Development of Ton Duc Thang University (FOSTECT) under project FOSTECT.2014.BR.03.

References

[1] J. Atmadja, A.C. Bagtzoglou, *Marching-jury backward beam equation and quasi-reversibility methods for hydrologic inversion: Application to contaminant plume spatial distribution recovery*. WRR 39, 1038C1047 (2003).

[2] J.R. Cannon, P. Duchateau, *Structural identification of an unknown source term in a heat equation*, Inverse Problems 14 (1998) 535-551.

[3] Wei Cheng, C.L. Fu, *Identifying an unknown source term in a spherically symmetric parabolic equation*, Applied Mathematics Letters, Vol 26, (2013) 387-391.

[4] M. Denche, K. Bessila, *A modified quasi-boundary value method for ill-posed problems*, J.Math.Anal.Appl, Vol. 301, 2005, pp. 419-426.

[5] E. G. Savateev, *On problems of determining the source function in a parabolic equation*, J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl. 3 (1995) 83-102.

[6] A. Farcas, D. Lesnic, *The boundary-element method for the determination of a heat source dependent on one variable*, J. Eng. Math. 54 (2006) 375-388.

[7] A. Hasanov, *Identification of spacewise and time dependent source terms in 1D heat conduction equation from temperature measurement at a final time*. Int. J. Heat Mass Transf. 55, 2069-2080 (2012).

[8] T. Johansson, D. Lesnic, *Determination of a spacewise dependent heat source*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 209 (2007) 66-80.

[9] A. Qian, Y. Li, *Optimal error bound and generalized Tikhonov regularization for identifying an unknown source in the heat equation*, J. Math. Chem. 49 (2011), No. 3, 765-775.

[10] D.D. Trong, N.T. Long, P.N. Dinh Alain, *Nonhomogeneous heat equation: Identification and regularization for the inhomogeneous term*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 312 (2005) 93-104.

[11] D.D. Trong, P.H. Quan, P.N.D. Alain, *Determination of a two dimensional heat source: uniqueness, regularization and error estimate*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 191 (2006) 50-67.

[12] L. Yang, C.L. Fu, F.L. Yang, *The method of fundamental solutions for the inverse heat source problem*, Eng. Anal. Bound. Elem. 32 (2008) 216-222.

[13] F. Yang, C.L-Fu, *Two regularization methods for identification of the heat source depending only on spatial variable for the heat equation*. J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl. 17 (2009), No. 8, 815-830.

[14] F. Yang, C.L-Fu, *A simplified Tikhonov regularization method for determining the heat source*, Applied Mathematical Modelling, Vol 34, (2010), 3286-3299.

[15] F. Yang, C.L-Fu, *A mollification regularization method for the inverse spatial-dependent heat source problem*, J. Comput. Appl. Math, Vol 255, (2014) 555-567.

[16] D.D. Trong, N. H. Tuan, *A nonhomogeneous backward heat problem: Regularization and error estimates*, Electron. J. Diff. Eqns., Vol. 2008 , No. 33, pp. 1-14.

[17] Z. Wanga and J. Liu, *Identification of the pollution source from one-dimensional parabolic equation models*, Appl. Math. Comput. 219 (2012), No. 8, 3403-3413.

[18] O. Scherzer, *The use of Morozov's discrepancy principle for Tikhonov regularization for solving nonlinear ill-posed problems*, Computing, Vol. 51, (1993) pp 45-60.

[19] D. Coltony, M. Pianayand, R. Potthast, *A simple method using Morozovs discrepancy principle for solving inverse scattering problems*, Inverse Problems **13** (1997) 14771493.

[20] A. Kirsch, *An Introduction to the Mathematical Theory of Inverse Problems (Second Edition)*, Applied Mathematical Sciences 120, Springer, (2011)

[21] D. McLaughlin, *Investigation of alternative procedures for estimating groundwater basin parameters*, Water Res. Eng., Walnut Creek, Calif., (1975)

[22] W. W-G. Yeh, *Review of Parameter Identification Procedures in Groundwater Hydrology: The Inverse Problem*, Water Res. Research, Vol. 2(2), (1986)

[23] J. Carrera, *State of the art of the inverse problem applied to the flow and solute transport problem, in Groundwater Flow and Quality Modeling*, NATO ASI Ser., (1987)

[24] T. R. Ginn and J. H. Cushman *Inverse methods for subsurface flow: A critical review of stochastic techniques*, Stochastic Hydrol. Hydraul., (1990)

[25] L. Kuiper, *A comparison of several methods for solution of the inverse problem in two-dimensional steady state groundwater flow modeling*, Water Res. Research, Vol. 22(5), (1986)
[26] N.Z. Sun, *Inverse Problems in Groundwater Modeling*, Kluwer Acad., Norwell, Mass. (1994)
[27] D. McLaughlin and L. R. Townley, *A reassessment of the groundwater inverse problem*, Water Res. Research, Vol. 32(5), (1996)
[28] E. P. Poeter and M. C. Hill, *Inverse Models: A necessary next step in groundwater modeling*, Groundwater, Vol. 35(2), (1997)

ϵ	$E_1^{\mu_1}$	$E_2^{\mu_1}$	$E_1^{\mu_2}$	$E_2^{\mu_2}$
5.0E-01	2.19973047E-01	6.25280883E-01	2.37722314E-01	6.75733186E-01
1.0E-01	4.84352308E-02	1.37678794E-01	5.74458438E-02	1.63291769E-01
5.0E-02	2.61788488E-02	7.44142701E-02	2.83719452E-02	8.06482211E-02
1.0E-02	8.18020277E-03	2.32525051E-02	8.06299020E-03	2.29193244E-02
5.0E-03	5.77361943E-03	1.64117100E-02	5.73993055E-03	1.63159482E-02
1.0E-03	4.80971954E-03	1.36717917E-02	4.54649392E-03	1.29235639E-02
5.0E-04	4.67487514E-03	1.32884919E-02	4.54039711E-03	1.29062335E-02
1.0E-04	4.48497982E-03	1.27487080E-02	4.41615901E-03	1.25530824E-02
5.0E-05	4.44987772E-03	1.26489290E-02	4.41003343E-03	1.25356703E-02
1.0E-05	4.41942400E-03	1.25623633E-02	4.40598999E-03	1.25241767E-02

Table 1: Error estimate between the exact solution and its regularized solution for the a priori parameter and the a posteriori parameter choice rules in Example 1.

ϵ	$E_1^{\mu_1}$	$E_2^{\mu_1}$	$E_1^{\mu_2}$	$E_2^{\mu_2}$
5.0E-01	8.73911561E+01	6.23557272E-01	1.68095756E+02	1.19940433E+00
1.0E-01	1.73478908E+01	1.23781444E-01	1.68873801E+01	1.20495587E-01
5.0E-02	9.04295359E+00	6.45236855E-02	1.05889724E+01	7.55549079E-02
1.0E-02	2.51478744E+00	1.79436234E-02	1.77559899E+00	1.26693331E-02
5.0E-03	1.33146975E+00	9.50036234E-03	7.94414569E-01	5.66834224E-03
1.0E-03	4.04066751E-01	2.88311509E-03	1.79227628E-01	1.27883296E-03
5.0E-04	2.24155836E-01	1.59940671E-03	8.74185405E-02	6.23752667E-04
1.0E-04	7.42023262E-02	5.29451745E-04	1.85142488E-02	1.32103693E-04
5.0E-05	4.58148569E-02	3.26900209E-04	9.69012336E-03	6.66814607E-05
1.0E-05	1.56186641E-02	1.11442988E-04	1.86120018E-03	1.32801185E-05

Table 2: Error estimation between the exact solution and its regularized solution for both the a priori parameter choice rule and the a posteriori parameter choice rule in Example 2.



(a) $\epsilon = 10^{-1}$



(b) $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$



(c) $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$



(d) $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$

Figure 1: A comparison between the exact solution and its regularized solution for the a priori parameter choice rule in Example 1



(a) $\epsilon = 10^{-1}$



(b) $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$



(c) $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$



(d) $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$

Figure 2: A comparison between the exact solution and its regularized solution for the a posteriori parameter choice rule in Example 1



(a) $\epsilon = 5 \times 10^{-1}$



(b) $\epsilon = 5 \times 10^{-2}$



(c) $\epsilon = 5 \times 10^{-3}$



(d) $\epsilon = 5 \times 10^{-4}$

Figure 3: A comparison between the exact solution and its regularized solution for the a priori parameter choice rule in Example 2



(a) $\epsilon = 5 \times 10^{-1}$



(b) $\epsilon = 5 \times 10^{-2}$



(c) $\epsilon = 5 \times 10^{-3}$



(d) $\epsilon = 5 \times 10^{-4}$

Figure 4: A comparison between the exact solution and its regularized solution for the a posteriori parameter choice rule in Example 2